

U.S. Application Serial No.: 10/670,353

Reply to Office Action of: July 13, 2006

AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWINGS

Please substitute the amended drawing showing Figs. 16C, 16D and 16B for the respective drawing currently of record in the application. The original of the amended drawing accompanies this Response.

REMARKS

In the Outstanding Office Action Claims 9 and 12-27 have been withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b). It has been indicated by the Examiner that Applicants timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement. Applicants reconfirm their rights to file divisional application(s) for the embodiment of claims 9 and 12-27.

As required by the Examiner in the Outstanding Office Action, the specification and the drawings have been amended by the applicant. Such amendment has been provided only to accommodate the Examiners requirements and do not introduce a new matter into the application.

In the outstanding Office Action claims 1-8, 10 and 11 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bell, et al., GB 2 089 216 A. In the Office Action the Examiner argues that the cited references disclose a base unit 2, a platform comprising baseplate 20, and an adjustment device 22-25 and 30-32 *and/or* 8 and 34-39. Regarding Claim 2, the Examiner argues that the support bar corresponds to the lock pawl 8. Regarding Claim 3, it is indicated by the Examiner that the support element is viewed as the upper

portion of shin unit 2, said portion including shinstop 34 (Figure 1); the support bar 8 is capable of receiving resilient member 10, for example. Regarding Claims 4 and 5, the position of the support bar 8 relative to the support element 34 is adjusted by means of threadable members 37 and 38 *capable* of engaging the support bar 8. Regarding Claim 6, it has been engaged that threading the lock stop screw 37 further inwardly (after loosening the security screw 38) lowers the position of the support bar 8 and thus moves the anterior part of the platform (including baseplate 20) downwardly (against the resilient resistance offered by the rubber extension bumpers 6). Regarding Claim 7, the platform is viewed as further comprising the knee unit 1, with the flat table comprising baseplate 20 and other upper elements; the knee unit 1 having spaced apart side plates would have been inherent from the ball races 4 being spaced apart by the spacer 5 (page 2, lines 55-59) and from the need to accommodate the piston rod of the damper 13.

Applicants respectfully consider that the invention as defined in the currently amended independent Claim 1 is patentable over the references cited by the Examiner. Specifically, in the opinion of the applicants the prior art does not disclose an adjustment device for adjustment of pivotal movement of the platform relative to the base, wherein the adjustment device is situated with an anterior proximal region of the base. The device comprises a support bar movably arranged relative to the anterior proximal region of the base unit and a support

element interconnecting the interior proximal region of the first and second sides members and the support bar is adapted to receive a resilient member.

Applicants respectfully consider that the above-discussed rejection of the claims is moot in view of the claims amendment provided in the Response.

In view of the above, it is respectfully considered that the present invention, as defined by the claims currently of record in the application, is patentable over the references of record in the application. Thus, withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection and allowance of the claims currently in the application are respectfully requested.

The Applicants have made the best faith effort to place this application in the condition for allowance. However, if any issue raised by the Patent Office has been inadvertently left unanswered, the Examiner is authorized to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed herein below.


U.S. Application Serial No.: **10/670,353**

Reply to Office Action of: **July 13, 2006**

Applicants respectfully Petition for three month extension of time. The respective Petition and the required fee accompany this Response.

Respectfully submitted,
SILBER & FRIDMAN

Lawrence G. Fridman,
Registration No. 31,615
Attorney for Applicant



1037 Rt 46 East, Suite 207
Clifton, New Jersey 07013
Telephone (973) 779-2580
Fax (973) 779-4473
PTORESPONSE03_239.doc